

REMARKS

In view of the above amendments and following remarks, reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

I. Claim of Priority

Applicants respectfully request that the claim of foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. §119 be acknowledged by the Examiner.

II. Amendments to the Claims

Claim 31 has been amended to overcome the objection set forth in item 5 on page 2 of the Office Action. As a result, withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

III. 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejection

Claim 24-46 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Schoenfeld, Ku and the Admitted Prior Art (APA). This rejection is respectfully traversed for the reasons discussed below.

Independent claim 24 recites a data transmission device connected to a ring-type data transmission network and for electrically communicating with other devices of the ring-type data transmission network via a transmission line in a unidirectional manner, such that the data transmission device receives an electric signal only from a preceding device of the ring-type data transmission network and the data transmission device transmits an electric signal only to a

successive device of the ring-type data transmission network. In addition, claim 24 recites that the data transmission device includes, a processing section, a transmission section, a power supply section and a reception section for receiving an electric signal sent from the preceding device, such that the reception section detects a cessation of the electric signal sent from the preceding device. Further, claim 24 recites that, when the reception section detects the cessation, (i) the power supply section stops supplying power to the processing section, the reception section, and the transmission section, (ii) the reception section stops operating, and (iii) the transmission section stops operating and stops transmitting the electric signal converted from the result of the processing by the processing section to the successive device.

Based on the structure required by claim 24, when the reception section detects the cessation of the electric signal sent from the preceding device, the data transmission device enters a “power down mode” (i.e., power is no longer supplied to the processing, reception and transmission sections and the reception and transmission sections stop operating).

Initially, please note that the above-described 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection relies on Schoenfeld for teaching the above-identified distinguishing features of the claimed invention. Specifically, the rejection relies on Schoenfeld for teaching the detection of a “power down” condition (see sixth paragraph on page 5 of the Office Action, which relies on col. 1, lines 1-14, col. 3, lines 1-55, col. 6, lines 61-67 and claim 1 of Schoenfeld for teaching the above-mentioned limitations of claim 24).

However, Schoenfeld merely teaches detecting a transition from high to low of a CKE signal in order to determine to put an electronic device into sleep mode to enable a fast power

down (see col. 3, lines 35-39).

Thus, in view of the above, it is clear that Schoenfeld teaches that, when the CKE signal transitions from high to low, the electronic device will enter sleep mode, but fails to disclose or suggest that when the reception section detects the cessation of the electric signal sent from the preceding device, the data transmission device enters a “power down mode” (i.e., power is no longer supplied to the processing, reception and transmission sections and the reception and transmission sections stop operating), as required by claim 24.

In other words, Schoenfeld’s disclosure of detecting a transition of a signal from a high state to a low state is not a disclosure or suggestion of detecting the cessation of the electric signal, because a signal in a low state, as taught by Schoenfeld, is not the cessation of the signal, as required by claim 24.

Therefore, because of the above-mentioned distinctions it is believed clear that claim 24 and claims 25-30 that depend therefrom would not have been obvious or result from any combination of Schoenfeld, Ku and the APA.

Furthermore, there is no disclosure or suggestion in Schoenfeld, Ku and the APA or elsewhere in the prior art of record which would have caused a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify Schoenfeld, Ku and the APA to obtain the invention of independent claim 24. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 24 and claims 25-30 that depend therefrom are clearly allowable over the prior art of record.

Independent claims 31 and 39 are directed to a system and a method, respectively and each recite features that correspond to the above-mentioned distinguishing features of

independent claim 24. Thus, for the same reasons discussed above, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 31 and 39 and claims 32-38 and 40-46 that depend therefrom are allowable over the prior art of record.

IV. Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance and an early notification thereof is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone to resolve any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Yuji MIZUGUCHI et al.

/Andrew L. Dunlap/

By: 2009.08.24 16:13:44 -04'00'

Andrew L. Dunlap
Registration No. 60,554
Attorney for Applicants

ALD/led
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
August 26, 2009